

Shannon Ambler

ACC Technology, Media, and Literature

Mr. Dixon

Feb-  
6 January 2018

“Playing God”

Perfection is not something that is easy to come by, especially when talking about the world and everything in it. In my world, my perfect world, there would be happiness, sunshine, and rainbows. Conflict is something that I think the world could do without especially when it comes to creating things that were not already created by God, thus creating the conflict of whether or not the creator is playing the role of “God” and then there is this huge big mess of things. In Mary Shelly’s *Frankenstein*, she explores <sup>into</sup> the man “playing God” <sup>aspect of</sup> things when her character Victor Frankenstein creates a monster from dead bodies and gives him life.

I have always been afraid of the scientific aspect of the world, the possibility of what different scientists are creating taking over everything and controlling us is terrifying to me, I say this because with new advances in technology it could potentially happen. Now, Victor Frankenstein creates his monster because he wants attention and recognition. He does not even stop to think that ~~maybe~~ what he was doing could be potentially dangerous. He wanted to prove that his intelligence reached an area that no one else’s could. He gave life to something that was no longer living, because he wanted glory:

A mind of moderate capacity which closely pursues one study must infallibly arrive at great proficiency in that study; and I, who continually sought the attainment of one object of pursuit and was solely wrapped up in this, improved so rapidly that at the end

*Handwritten notes:*

- confusing
- aspect of
- use nice... change one of them
- I'm nervous that this should be a comma...
- I think a semicolon?
- but I'm bad at this, but
- ACT prep helped
- anyways, since it is describing the thing after it I'm pretty sure it should be ; or maybe
- it is ; I forget
- TBH
- Saying same sentences the same thing
- don't need both so the maybe out

of two years I made some discoveries in the improvement of some chemical instruments, which procured me great esteem and admiration at the university (44).

I personally think that experiments like this should not occur for they could result very poorly. I am a firm believer in the fact that God created the world as he wanted it and that there should be no cloning, no creating the perfect genes for a baby, and no monsters. If God wanted us to be able to choose how our babies turn out then we would have always been able to do so. If God wanted two Channing Tatum's in the world he would have done so himself. (I do not think that doing these kind of things are humane, nor are up to humans to do.) So if, and only if, these things do happen at the very least the "creator" needs to be able to take care of their creation, unlike Victor Frankenstein:

I had worked hard for nearly two years, for the sole purpose of infusing life into an inanimate body. For this I had deprived myself of rest and health. I had desired it with an ardour that far exceeded moderation; but now that I had finished, the beauty of the dream vanished, and breathless horror and disgust filled my heart (51).

What Frankenstein did is what I am afraid of, and the worst possible thing occurred to him. He became obsessed with his creation, he made himself sick, he cared solely about his creation until he saw it. And, yes, scientists may say that they will not <sup>"play god" as</sup> do what Frankenstein did ~~before they "play God"~~, but they do not know that for sure until after they have actually created something. Before Frankenstein created his monster he too thought he would be a good "father", "A new species would bless me as its creator and source; many happy and excellent natures would owe their being to me. No father could claim the gratitude of his child so completely as I

pretty sure it goes inside the " "

should deserve theirs" (47). And as soon as he saw what he had brought into this world he regretted it and abandoned his creation.

Now my point is, had there have been no monster created then absolutely <sup>not very profound - kinda vague. I know what you are saying, but you can say it better</sup> none of what occurred would have. There is no need for things that are not of nature to be created and be given life. If people could just be happy with what is already in this world then this type of threat would not even be possible. I am not saying that people should not be curious or that anyone should stop their "what if's", all I am saying is that I believe God created every living thing that he could have wanted already. So who are we as humans to try to take his role and attempt to create life that he himself ~~had~~ <sup>has</sup> not already created for us? Why should we get to "play God"?

Author's Name: Shannon Ambler  
Peer Reviewer's Name: Lily Barrison

### Reader Response Peer Review

Instructions: Read the paper once without pausing to write comments. Then read the paper again with the following questions in mind.

1. Does the introduction clearly present the writer's goal? If so, please write the goal of the essay below.

Yes, the author makes the point that she believes the Victor Frankenstein playing God is wrong. And she goes on in the paper to explain that.

2. Does the writer incorporate an effective introduction in order to make the paper's goal appear interesting and important? If so, write down the strategy below.

She begins with her opinion and then ties it into the book. It makes an interesting start to the paper and makes the reader contemplate one of the themes from the book.

3. Does the writer employ varied sentences structures or does he/she repeat the same structures throughout the essay? Circle one sentence that would benefit from being rewritten. Write down the essay's best sentence below.

Yes, she does have varying sentences. Her sentence that needs work is in brackets since I did it before I got to this question.

"There is no need for things that are not of nature to be created and be given life" (3). This sentence is well written, to the point, and gives your argument in a concise manner.

4. Does the conclusion present a judgment or culminating idea? If so, and gives your argument in a concise manner, write it down below. If not, provide the writer with an example of how he/she might more effectively end the essay.

Why should we get to play God?

I like that you ended it with a question to make the reader think.

also like  
end on  
2  
is in  
)  
it is  
good

5. Does the writer use punctuation properly? Is the semi-colon overused? Does the writer make use of hyphen and colons when appropriate? Circle any places where you think the punctuation may be improved and suggest potential alternatives.

There are no over used forms of punctuation. There are no hyphens and like one colon, but I don't think she needs any of them really.

6. List one way this essay could be improved.

The argument is sound, so just the few things I noted need to be changed, specifically that sentence in the intro.

7. Respond to the author's specific concerns:

1. YES.

2. Read this packet & look @ my markings 😊

On another note, just questioning your argument... If you only want the things that God created → he created Adam and Eve and free will, conflict is a result of free will and the fall into sin. So then essentially conflict comes from God.